1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
_	WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA	
2	Charlottesville Division	
3	CYNTHIA B. SCOTT, et al., Civil No. 3:12cv0003	б
4	Plaintiffs,	
5		
	vs. Harrisonburg, Virgin	ia
6	HAROLD W. CLARKE, et al.,	
7		
0	Defendants. May 30, 2018	
8		
9		
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOEL C. HOPPE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
10	GMITED STHIES AMOISTANTE GODGE	
11	APPEARANCES:	
12	For the Plaintiffs: ANGELA CIOLFI	
	BRENDA CASTANEDA	
13	SHANNON ELLIS KIMBERLY ROLLA	
14		
1.5	1000 Preston Ave, Suite	A
15	Charlottesville VA 22903	
16		
17	Kelly & Crandall, PLC 3925 Chain Bridge Rd.	
1/	Suite 202	
18		
19	THEODORE HOWARD	
19	Wiley Rein LLP	
20		
21	Washington DC 20006	
21	Court Reporter: Sonia Ferris, RPR, OCR	
22		
22	116 N. Main St. Room 314	
23	Harrisonburg, VA 22802 540.434.3181. Ext. 7	
24		
0.5	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcri	pt
25	produced by computer.	

```
1
    (APPEARANCES Continued:)
 2
    For the Defendants:
                                           ELIZABETH MULDOWNEY
                                           RUTH GRIGGS
3
                                           Sands Anderson, PC
                                           1111 East Main St.
 4
                                           Suite 2400
                                           Richmond VA 23218-1998
 5
                                           DIANE ABATO
                                           VICTORIA PEARSON
 6
                                           Office of Attorney General
 7
                                           900 E. Main St.
                                           Richmond VA 23219
8
                                           KATHERINE LONDOS
9
                                           NATHAN SCHNETZLER
                                           Frith Anderson & Peake PC
10
                                           29 Franklin Rd. SW
                                           Roanoke VA 24011
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
THE COURT: Good morning. This is Joel Hoppe.
1
             Who is on the line for the plaintiffs?
2
3
            MS. CIOLFI: Good morning.
             This is Angela Ciolfi with the Legal Aid Justice
4
5
    Center, for the plaintiff, and with me in the room are Brenda
    Castaneda and Shannon Ellis, also with the Legal Aid Justice
6
7
    Center.
             I heard a lot of chiming in, so I'm not entirely sure
8
9
    who else for plaintiffs is on the line.
10
            MS. NASH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
11
             This is Casey Nash from Kelly and Crandall on behalf
    of the plaintiffs as well.
12
13
            MS. ROLLA: Your Honor, Kimberly Rolla on behalf of
14
    the plaintiffs, with Legal Aid Justice Center.
            MR. HOWARD: Good morning, Your Honor.
15
            This is Ted Howard from Wiley and Rein in Washington
16
17
    for the plaintiffs.
18
            THE COURT: Good morning to all of you.
             Who's on the line for the defendants?
19
20
            MS. LONDOS: Katherine Londos and Nate Schnetzler,
    with Frith Anderson & Peake in Roanoke.
            MS. ABATO: Diana Abato and Victoria Pearson with the
22
    AG's office in Richmond.
23
24
            MS. MULDOWNEY: Elizabeth Muldowney from Sands
25
    Anderson in Richmond.
```

MS. GRIGGS: Ruth Griggs from Sands Anderson.

THE COURT: Karen Dotson is also on the line and she's recording this hearing so there is a record of our discussions today.

We are here on the defendant's motion to continue and I have reviewed the plaintiff's response to that.

Who's going to address the motion for the defendants?

MS. LONDOS: Good morning, Your Honor. This is

Katherine Londos with Frith Anderson and Peake in Roanoke.

Your Honor, shortly before we got on this call, the defense made a determination that we would withdraw -- we are withdrawing the motion for a continuance. Defendants are ready to proceed, and, thus, we will withdraw the motion.

Again, that decision was made just shortly prior to getting on the call.

There is one caveat I want to mention, and I raise this simply as -- in my role as an officer of the court. We have serious reservations that this is a five-day proceeding. We are ready to go. We're not asking for a continuance as stated in the motion at this time, but feel an obligation to advise Your Honor and the court, generally, that given the posture of this case, and even given the agreement reached this morning with counsel that we would -- both sides would simultaneously reduce and narrow their witness and exhibit lists by the end of this week, it seems like a big bite for a

five-day. So we have no reservations, but I certainly would want to advise the Court. I do not want to arrive and have Judge Moon look at us and ask what we all thought we could do in five days. So I raise that issue simply by way of just putting that out there, but not asking for a continuance at this time.

Thank you.

THE COURT: I think that's something that we certainly can address today.

Are there some ways to try and manage the amount of information that you all want to present at the hearing so that each side can fairly present its case? I think we all should -- there have been a number of motions filed in the last day or so that I think we also need to figure out when responses are going to be filed on those, and there's a hearing scheduled for -- I believe it's June 8th -- where those motions can be taken up. But just given the volume of the motions and the short amount of time that Judge Moon will have to address them, you know, it may be that he'll have to address them in an opinion that's issued after the hearing. I think that's just a possibility that y'all would need to contemplate.

MS. LONDOS: Your Honor, this is Katherine Londos again.

Several members of the plaintiffs' team and I had a

conversation this morning. We are working together to 1 2 narrow, specifically, the exhibit and witness lists, but 3 other issues. Those discussions, I know, will be ongoing. We're making those efforts. It is still -- I'm saying this 4 5 with an understanding of how sometimes these things work. don't want to get in a situation where Judge Moon looks at us 6 7 later and says counsel should have brought this to my attention -- to the Court's attention, that this was a lot. 8 It's in that spirit that I raise the issue. 9 10 THE COURT: Right. I understand that. 11 When do you all think -- have you set a deadline for when you're going to shoot to have these narrowed? 12 13 MS. LONDOS: Friday. 14 THE COURT: Friday. Will you advise the Court of any narrowing or, you 15 know, some issues you can take off Judge Moon's plate by 16 17 then? 18 MS. LONDOS: What we talked about specifically this morning was narrowing the exhibit and witness lists. I know 19 20 all these motions were filed last evening and we're still processing them, but I know I speak for the defense team that 21 we will be taking a close look at them and the legal issues 22 that can be agreed upon or stipulated to or anything along 23 24 those lines, we will do that. We're just -- I'm not even --25 I haven't even had a chance to download them all and open

them all yet before the phone call.

THE COURT: Okay.

How about for the plaintiffs? Do you have anything you want to say along what Ms. Londos is discussing?

MS. CIOLFI: Yes, Your Honor. This is Angela Ciolfi for the plaintiff.

We certainly welcome the withdrawal of the continuance and appreciate Ms. Londos and the Court's efforts to try to streamline the process as much as possible for the hearing. You know, we do acknowledge that there's a lot of information. Both parties have submitted, as of last night, extensive pretrial briefing, so that should provide some opportunity to frame the issues. The plaintiffs have designated several depositions, and as -- with defendants' motion for summary judgment as well, so, hopefully, we'll be able to offer a lot of deposition designations as a way to reduce live testimony to be presented.

As Ms. Londos said, plaintiffs offered, and defendants have agreed, to simultaneously agree to narrow the exhibit and witness lists. We are also -- plaintiffs are also working on factual stipulations.

The exhibit and witness lists -- we did agree to exchange those on Friday. I think just given where we are in the week that it would probably likely take, you know, some portion of the day to do that. So with that and the motions

that were filed last night and the stipulation that we would 1 2 like to present to the defendants as quickly as possible, we 3 would ask that maybe we advise the Court on Monday, giving us, you know, the weekend, unfortunately, to hash things out 4 5 as much as we can. I think we might actually have more information to provide the Court by Monday. 6 7 We certainly welcome any other ideas the Court has for managing the information to be presented. 8 9 THE COURT: Have you all discussed a date for filing 10 responses to the motion to exclude experts and the motion for 11 summary judgment? 12 MS. LONDOS: We have not, no. 13 THE COURT: What did you envision? There's a hearing 14 date scheduled for the 8th. I imagine that would be what you all would use to address these motions. 15 MS. LONDOS: Your Honor, I apologize. Just with them 16 17 coming in late last night, on that particular question, I 18 have not had a chance to consult my colleagues on the defense side on that. Certainly, that's on the table to be discussed 19 20 today. We just haven't gotten to it this morning. 2.1 MS. CIOLFI: And this is Angela Ciolfi. 22 Plaintiffs are in the same position as well. would like -- I think having a deadline would be a good thing 23 24 for all involved, but I wouldn't want to overly promise,

25

given the time restraints.

THE COURT: I would suggest that Judge Moon is going 1 2 to need more than a day to consider responses. 3 MS. LONDOS: May I suggest that I consult with Angela Ciolfi, and we can continue our discussions -- myself, being 4 5 the representative of the defense team, and Ms. Ciolfi being the representative from the plaintiffs -- that we consult, 6 7 hopefully by the end of the day today, to see if we can come to some agreement on that? 8 9 THE COURT: Sure. I think that's fine. We'll be 10 happy to let you all have the first crack at figuring that 11 out. 12 Are there still depositions outstanding? 13 MS. LONDOS: Yes. And Ms. Riggs may be in a better 14 position to say exactly from our side. I think maybe even 15 today. Is that correct, Ms. Riggs? 16 17 MS. RIGGS: Due to circumstances beyond everyone's 18 control, we had to postpone Dr. Gable's deposition until next Tuesday. There was a death at the jail last night and he, as 19 20 the medical doctor, is involved and has not slept yet. 21 counsel decided it would be more appropriate to give him an 22 opportunity to sleep and prepare for next week. Then my understanding, Mr. Hasher's 30(b)(6) is on 23 24 Friday, so that will leave Mr. Hasher's 30(b)(6) on Friday, 25 an expert deposition for Dr. Gable and his 30(b)(6) on

1 Tuesday. 2 Counsel and I have been working today to narrow our 3 understanding of the testimony that Dr. Gable would potentially be providing as a 26(a)(2)(C) expert, making 4 5 clear it's a very limited scope. Essentially, treater 6 testimony. Hopefully, we'll be able to cut down some of the 7 time for both his expert deposition and his 30(b)(6) next week. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MS. CIOLFI: Yes. I believe there's one more 11 discussion of a short continuation of one of defendant's experts that was scheduled for tomorrow. 12 13 MS. RIGGS: Yes, that's tomorrow. I forgot about 14 that one. I'm sorry. 15 THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you this. As to the actual hearing, have 16 17 you all given some thought to allocating each side time to 18 present evidence just to make sure that one side doesn't 19 monopolize the time? 20 MS. CIOLFI: This is Angela Ciolfi. 21 We have discussed that to some extent. It's a little 22 bit complicated by one thing that is, I think, probably inherent in every case and one thing that's a little unique 23 24 about this case. The first one, it's just very difficult to 25 commit to time frames when neither side is in control of the

other person's cross. I know the plaintiffs, you know, are working very diligently to try to contain and to reduce the number of witnesses and contain the amount of evidence that will be presented in their case in chief to allow the defendants an opportunity to present their defense and for us to cross-examine their witnesses, but there are some factors outside of our control.

The second one that is more unique is that there is some -- and the plaintiff has filed a motion in limine on this question -- about the time frame of the relevant period for determining liability for contempt, and that is whether the time frame is from the time the consent order was entered in February of 2016 to when the motion for show cause was filed in September of 2017, or whether it's the entire period leading up to today's status.

Both parties acknowledge that the period between

September -- and my intent in laying this out is not to argue

the motion but simply to illustrate to the Court that there

is some difficulty in figuring out how the evidence will be

presented without some resolution of that issue.

Both parties have acknowledged that the evidence -the facts and circumstances following the motion to show
cause leading up to today are relevant, but we are still in
conversations with defendants' counsel about what the -their position on the appropriate time period for liability.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LONDOS: Your Honor, this is Katherine Londos.

The only thing I would add is that -- and this is always an issue on the defense side of the table -- is that we are always concerned that the allotted time will be occupied disproportionately by the plaintiff and the defendant will not be left with enough time. That is inherent in the nature of trial practice but one that we are mindful of, particularly in this case. We certainly don't want to be left with, you know, two hours on Friday afternoon to present our case. Those discussions have been ongoing and I imagine will continue to be ongoing. We're just mindful of that potential as often happens in these cases. Nothing unique about this case in particular.

THE COURT: These conversations may be more fruitful after Friday when you've narrowed your witness and exhibit lists, but certainly each side has a right to present its case.

MS. CIOLFI: Your Honor, this is Angela Ciolfi again.

May I ask for clarification on the deadline for responses for motions in limine that were filed yesterday?

In addition to the motions in limine, defendants also filed a motion for summary judgment, which is, you know, of much greater magnitude, of course, than a motion in limine would be. I believe plaintiffs' position will be that that motion

was untimely filed, so, you know, we'll, of course, address that in the briefing, but I just want to clarify that the Court does not intend that we would be fully briefing their 46-page motion and supporting exhibits by the time to have it heard on June 8th.

THE COURT: You know, I would think it would be really probably an impossible task for Judge Moon to be able to rule on the motion for summary judgment prior to the commencement of the hearing. Usually, those motions are filed, under a typical scheduling order, 75 days before trial, and heard 45 days before or after full briefing. So that will be a real challenge.

Ms. Londos, what's your view on that?

MS. LONDOS: Your Honor, this case has been unusual in so many regards, but one in particular has been the schedule and the way this case has developed beyond what I think anyone anticipated back in December of 2017 when I think a good number of the attorneys on this call today were not even -- were not involved in the case yet.

The number of depositions taken in the last 60 days, and even the number of depositions taken after May 1, which was the court's discovery cutoff, is significant. I have them typed out here and there are, you know -- I don't want to miscount, but -- some were 30(b)(6) depositions, but there's been 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 now depositions taken after the

discovery cutoff. We have been working diligently. We have been working collaboratively and cooperatively with counsel to get everything scheduled. But a lot of what has happened in this case has happened in the last 30 days. So that's unique. Usually, for those of us in trial practice, we're very familiar with the idea of something happening after the discovery cutoff -- supplemental disclosures and an occasional deposition. But overall, it feels like a very large percentage of the discovery in this case happened in May, and continues to happen. I can't even keep up with the emails that are coming in about supplemental disclosures, et cetera. So it's just been a different dynamic than most of the other cases we're all involved in.

So that's where we are and that's why the motions are being filed when they're filed is, simply, we haven't got that far. Again, as an indicator, there were depositions last week and there are depositions this week. It's been an ongoing process.

MS. CIOLFI: Your Honor, I would just like to point out that the pretrial schedule was the schedule that the defendants agreed to with full knowledge of what the scope of this case entailed, including the 56 supporting -- not declarations but exhibits -- that accompanied plaintiffs' voluminous motions. So this is really a case of buyer's remorse on the part of the defendants, and not surprise.

This is the schedule that we all agreed to and did not contemplate motion for summary judgment to be filed. contemplated the filing of a pretrial brief as of yesterday, which is what the plaintiffs filed. The defendants did have the opportunity to fully brief the motion for show cause that the plaintiff filed back in September, and they did brief that, after which both parties had a status conference before Judge Moon in which he expressly declined to rule on the show cause until the time of trial. I would submit that the plaintiffs -- that that is where we stand and that the plaintiffs have tried to accommodate the numerous delays in production and rescheduling of depositions due to availability of defendants' witnesses and their lawyers, and that we should not now be penalized by the lateness of the discovery because of the plaintiffs' willingness to accommodate the multiple schedule changes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me just cut in for a second.

You know, I can see that both sides have been working really hard on this case and there's been a great volume of discovery in a pretty compressed time and significant motions practice. So it does seem to me that -- I think the way this case has unfolded is unusual. The pretrial order does not expressly contemplate motions for summary judgment. I think that will be something that -- you know, plaintiffs can certainly raise that with Judge Moon. I don't know what he

would say on that, but I would imagine that he certainly would want to allow the plaintiffs adequate time to respond to the dispositive motions. I don't see how he could rule on that prior to the hearing, though. I would think that that would be something that he would address in a post-hearing opinion.

Go ahead, Ms. Londos.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LONDOS: This is Katherine Londos again.

Maybe this hearing is a microcosm of this case in general, but I feel like this hearing -- we've morphed a little bit into, sort of, the issues with the motion for continuance. We do -- the defense -- I want to be clear -wants to be heard on the summary judgment motion. summary judgment motion is, I think, crucial to the Court's hearing of this case. The refrain that we've heard over and over again is we both have enough attorneys on both sides of the aisle to get everything done. Hence, all these depositions that have been scheduled. The defense believes it's important that Judge Moon hear the issues before the hearing, and I will not for a minute concede that the defense has been less than diligent and less than attentive in everything in this case, and I'm not going to rehash everything, but that is one point that I want to make clear. There's been extensive efforts to get everything done and, certainly, a lot of these depositions are only happening

because they were requested later in the process. But the -we would respectfully ask the opportunity to be heard on the
summary judgment before the hearing, and I understand that we
are dealing with a complicated calendar issue, but at the
beginning of this case, there was an agreement on limited
discovery and that's what we thought we were getting, and it
has not turned out to be, from the defense perspective,
limited.

THE COURT: Well, don't forget. You all can add attorneys to the case but Judge Moon doesn't get to add judges or law clerks. I know that they are looking at everything. They're going to do their best to address all these motions meaningfully and properly.

I think it will really be -- I mean, I'll be in touch with Judge Moon and certainly will let him know that you all want to have a motion for summary judgment heard, I imagine, on the 8th at the hearing, but I think there's going to have to be some consideration about when the plaintiffs' brief is due and, Ms. Ciolfi, if you're going to raise the time window, I would encourage you to do that sooner rather than later. I don't know what Judge Moon will say on that.

MS. LONDOS: If I could just add -- and I will stop talking. I don't mean to keep adding. But if the Court will not hear the motion for summary judgment prior to the hearing, that would, I guess, raise the issue of a

continuance again. Again, while we're ready to go, we would 1 2 like the opportunity to be heard. So I would imagine that 3 Judge Moon will know what he wants to do on that point, but we would -- if that involves a continuance to allow us to be 4 5 heard, that would be our position -- is that we would like to be allowed to be heard, notwithstanding everything that's 6 7 been said thus far in this hearing. THE COURT: Like I said, I think he'd try to hear the 8 9 motion, but I don't know that you're going to have a ruling 10 on that before trial. You know, it is a bench trial, so it 11 is probably a motion like the motion to exclude the experts 12 that can be addressed after the evidence has been presented. 13 There's one motion I think Judge Moon will take up, 14 and that's the defendants' motion for a view. If he agrees 15 to do that, I imagine that's something that could be done not during that five-day period? 16 17 MS. LONDOS: Absolutely, Your Honor. Whenever Judge Moon wants the site inspection, he 18 19 will get the site inspection. We will make that happen. 20 THE COURT: Are there some other considerations about the schedule and briefing or other things to raise today? 21 MS. CIOLFI: Your Honor, there are other motions 22 23 pending, not including the ones that were filed last night. 24 I don't know that -- I think one may be fully ripe; the

defendants' motion for an extension of email production.

25

don't think that the other motion has been fully briefed yet.

That would be the plaintiffs' motion for privilege waiver. I

think those are the ones that are pending other than the ones

that have procedurally been filed. I don't know if the Court

wants, at this time, to hear those or not.

THE COURT: I think those are some of the outstanding motions in front of me, and there are some motions to seal and things like that that I'll take up as soon as I can. I don't think that -- plaintiffs' motion now, of course, is not ripe. There's no response, but on the defendants' motion for extension, I planned on taking that up today.

What is the status of the email production? Is it still ongoing?

MS. LONDOS: Your Honor, it is still ongoing. We are continuing what I would call extensive efforts. The IT vendor is getting them to us, meaning the defense counsel.

We are processing them internally to review for privilege and relevancy issues and getting them out as they come. There are tens of thousands coming in to us and we have people dedicated here to reviewing them and getting them out. I think there's one -- another batch, hopefully, going out today or tomorrow. We have one that just came in end of last week. 16,008 files came in in the end of last week. 8,500 came in yesterday. So we are diligently and continuously working on that.

But I, too, was not prepared to fully argue that 1 2 motion today. THE COURT: Ms. Ciolfi, is there anything 3 preliminarily that you would want to say on that? The 4 5 production is ongoing and sounds like it's still -- are you receiving substantial amounts of emails? 6 7 MS. CIOLFI: Your Honor, if I could, I'd like to ask my colleague, Casey Nash, to respond regarding the motions. 8 9 THE COURT: Sure. 10 Ms. Nash? 11 MS. NASH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I think it's our position that -- I mean, the trial 12 13 starts in a matter of days. As the defendants have 14 indicated, they're still receiving tens of thousands of emails. This is discoverable information that's been 15 withheld from the plaintiffs and being produced at this late 16 17 stage. It's really going to be difficult for the plaintiff 18 to meaningfully use this and present this at trial, particularly given that our exhibit list is well past due. I 19 20 think, you know, we're now a month beyond the production date 21 that the Court ordered. So I think that sanctions are 22 appropriate because, you know, the Court ordered that this information be produced, and I understand it's a tall order 23 24 and I understand that both sides are working really hard. 25 I'm not going to accuse the defendants of dilatory conduct,

but the simple fact is this information was ordered by the Court. It wasn't produced by the deadline and I really think that causes some harm to the plaintiffs. So I think sanctions are appropriate.

MS. LONDOS: Your Honor, this is Katherine Londos.

I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Let me say that I'm not sure that it makes a whole lot of sense to -- if these emails aren't able to be used at trial, and if exhibit lists have been identified and you all are trying to winnow down the exhibit lists, that the production would continue.

I'm wondering, what is -- at this point, Ms. Nash, what would the purpose be, and are you all seeking that continued production? Would it make sense to hold it in abeyance at this time?

MS. NASH: I think our position is -- I mean, it's really hard for us to process information at this time, even if it's given to us. I'm not sure that it makes sense for the production to continue, given that it's not going to be useable. That being said, the plaintiffs provided a list of these 17 priority email boxes to the defendants on January 25th. During the April 12th hearing, the Northrop Grumman representative on the phone indicated that Northrop Grumman didn't receive the request for the 17 email boxes until April 4. This delay -- you know, I understand it's a

tall order. I understand everyone is working hard. Just not being able to receive this discoverable information in time for trial, given that timeline, I think it presents prejudice to the plaintiffs in preparing their case, and I think there has to be some consequence for that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me say this. I'm not going to go forward and address any prejudice or sanctions today, if that would be appropriate at all. I think we all recognize -- and I certainly did -- that it was going to be a very tall order to get all these emails produced. You know, the system for archiving emails and then retrieving them is -- it is really hard to understand why that was seen as a good way to do it, but I don't think that falls at these particular defendants' feet. That decision was made well above their pay grade so I don't know that it's at all appropriate for me to sanction them for something that seems like was really out of their control. Perhaps things could have been started earlier with the production, but given the request and information that was sought, it wasn't 17 custodians until we had whittled things down after, I think, maybe two hearings and then figured out that was going to be what the defendants needed to delve into. It was a much larger scope of email recovery that I voiced some concerns about proportionality of that overall initial request. So I don't think the delay, necessarily, all falls at the defendants' feet either.

Ms. Nash, as I understand, there are emails y'all are entitled to that you have not received at this time, but it sounds like there's been an effort to really get a lot of them in to you, and it may just be that balancing the plaintiffs' interests in going forward expeditiously and as contemplated with the hearing, there would just need to be a weighing that you all would have to do that, whether getting every shred of discovery that you're entitled to outweighs the need to go forward in June with the hearing, and it seems like the decision has been made to go forward with what you have and do the best with that information.

That's a longwinded way of saying if sanctions are something that you're seriously going to seek, I think we would need to address that in another hearing.

Ms. Londos, is there something you wanted to say?

MS. LONDOS: No, sir. Thank you.

MS. CIOLFI: Your Honor, this is Angela Ciolfi.

We would request the Court not rule on that at this time and give us an opportunity -- I think there may be some factual issues about the timing in which the plaintiffs narrowed their request that are relevant here, and we would like an opportunity to talk about whether an additional hearing might be necessary.

THE COURT: That's fine. I'm expressly not ruling on that issue today.

MS. LONDOS: Thank you, Your Honor. 1 2 MS. CIOLFI: Your Honor, there is one last thing. 3 apologize. So we -- as Ms. Griggs alluded to, we have 4 5 rescheduled Dr. Gable's deposition to Tuesday. The counsel 6 for both parties have been trying to resolve some objections 7 that were raised this morning as to the substance of that testimony, and we're at loggerheads. I think additional 8 9 discussions have happened. I hope that we'll be able to 10 resolve them, but I am anticipating that that may not be 11 possible. Would the Court like to -- I think it's in everyone's 12 13 interest to have this resolved before Tuesday. If we're 14 unable to resolve it, could we be able to get some time with 15 you on Monday or before? THE COURT: I have very good availability Thursday, 16 17 Friday, Monday. So yes. I will be available as long as you 18 all are. 19 MS. CIOLFI: Thank you. We appreciate that, and we 20 will make every effort to resolve it without bringing it to 21 your attention, and I'm sure I speak for both sides on that. 22 THE COURT: Let me tie up one thing with the emails. I'm going to order that the defendants can hold their 23 24 production in abeyance at this point. It doesn't seem it 25 makes sense for that to go forward given how extensive or how

```
much work it requires to do that, and the plaintiffs aren't
1
2
    going to be to be able to use those emails at trial.
3
            Anything else from the defendants?
            MS. LONDOS: No, sir. Thank you.
4
5
            THE COURT: Ms. Ciolfi, anything else from the
6
    plaintiffs?
7
            MS. CIOLFI: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
             THE COURT: Then we will -- you all are going to give
8
9
    us an update, perhaps as soon as later today, about when
10
    responses to motions to exclude will be filed, and I think
11
    it's still a bit of an open question about when the summary
12
    judgment -- when the opposition to summary judgment will be
13
    filed, but I think that's something you all also should
14
    consider, and I'll certainly let Judge Moon know that the
    defendants would like to be heard on the 8th on their motion
15
16
    for summary judgment.
17
             I think that's it.
             Counsel, thanks for calling in, and have a good day.
18
            MS. CIOLFI:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
19
20
            MS. LONDOS: Thank you.
21
    "I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
22
    the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
23
2.4
25
```